The Reformed Journal

e 4 — No. 10 A Periodical of Reformed Comment and Opinion November, 1954

S.F.T.S LIBRARY

The Three Pillars

by HARRY R. BOER

AN EVENING'S friendly conversation in Holland these days is apt first to turn to Mendes-France, then to the government's promise of lower taxes, perhaps a bit about Evanston, but from then on the "three pillars" and all that surrounds the subject may well take up the remainder of the time. The subject in itself is not a new one. In fact, nothing is more commonplace in Holland than the "three pillars." But sometimes an old subject receives a new significance. Precisely that is what has happened to the "three pillars." What are the three pillars?

Like Caesar's Gaul physically, so all of Holland is spiritually divided into three parts. They are the Protestant, Catholic, and Humanist sections of the population. To change the figure, Dutch society rests on three pillars. This is perhaps the better characterization because it translates literally the accepted description of the existing situation, namely "de drie zuilen." The question of the "zuilen" or pillars, and of the "verzuiling" or pillaring of Dutch society has seldom been so live and concrete in Holland as it is nowadays. The reason for this is a recent public declaration by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Before we take up that subject, however, it will be well to give a thumb-nail sketch of the history behind the division of Dutch society. The whole subject we are touching on here should be of more than spectator interest to the readers of the *Journal*. We are reading and hearing quite a bit in Reformed circles in America about Christian social action and about separate Christian organization. The prominence of the subject in America clearly takes its rise from Dutch antecedants and influences existing among us. It is therefore pertinent to ask what the situation on this score is in the country where public life is perhaps more than in any other country in the world controlled by a religiously conditioned division of the population.

The Rise of the Pillars

POLITICALLY and religiously Holland is a child of the Reformation. It is therefore in its public and in its private life a predominantly Protestant country. It is, however, much more Protestant in name than in fact. The Calvinists who form by far the majority of the Protestant population have never exceeded twenty-five percent of the population in its entirety. Other Protestant groups are very small. A very, very large percentage of what is called Protestant is better described as non-Catholic negatively and as Humanistic positively. The Catholics at the present time constitute about forty-five percent of the national population. Politically the Calvinists manage to make most of their population count. The Catholics have for long had from forty-five to forty-nine percent of all the children in the schools, but between the ages of fifteen and twenty-two a great many of these are lost so far as the vote is concerned. The Protestant parties (overwhelmingly Calvinist) have approximately twenty-five of the hundred seats in the lower chamber of Parliament, the Catholics thirty, and the non-religiously oriented parties the remainder. Of these the largest is the Socialist or Labor Party with thirty-one seats. But we are running a bit ahead of our story.

It was especially in the nineteenth century that the pronouncedly Protestant Christian character of Holland began to yield to a more neutral one in public life. The philosophy underlying the French Revolution and non-Christian thought emanating from Germany have

IN THIS ISSUE

The Three Pillars ..... *Harry R. Boer* 1
God's Way with the Jews ..... *Albert Huisjen* 6
Civic Good ..... *Clifton Orlebeke* 9
Geerhardus Vos ..... *J. G. Vanden Bosch* 11
The Way to Theology ..... *Robert Otten* 4
The Sudan United Mission ..... *Lillian V. Grissen* 14
Letters to the *Journal* 15

The Three Pillars — Continued

had great influence in the Netherlands. Politics, the schools, the press, social organization in general began to bear an increasingly neutral character. This neutralism was in fact not so neutral, of course. It is not an exaggeration to speak of an attitude of intolerance on the part of the country's leaders to those who refused to adjust themselves to the prevailing exclusion of positively Christian thought from public life. This attitude asserted itself to a large degree even in the Church. It is not possible to understand the Afscheiding (Separation) of 1834 apart from this background in the country as a whole.

In the second quarter of the nineteenth century there arose a lonely, aristocratic but powerful individual who recognized the situation for what it was. His name was Groen Van Prinsterer. Devoutly Christian in his convictions, Reformed in his thinking, intellectually brilliant, he became the spokesman for those who desired a Christian place in the national sun. Groen, as he is to this day familiarly called, did not get very far beyond the writing and the speaking stage. He was not an organizer, could not kindle the imagination of the masses. This awaited the rise of Groen's successor, Abraham Kuyper. These two men have left a stamp on modern Dutch life second to none. What had lived so powerfully in the thought of Groen became in Kuyper's program life and action. He was an orator, a thinker, an organizer. With competence to the point of brilliance he entered the areas of journalism, politics, theology, education, social betterment. Under his leadership the Anti-revolutionary party rose from a one man affair in the Parliament of 1874 to become the leading group in a Christian coalition between Protestants and Catholics twenty-seven years later of which Kuyper was the prime minister. The Protestant pillar in its political expression had been effectively set up.

The Roman Catholics had seen the beginning of this growth and were impressed. They, too, had a great leader, Herman J. A. M. Schaepman. Elected to the Parliament of 1880 he remained the inspiring leader of the Catholic party, aimed at cooperation with the Anti-revolutionaries, and saw his group influentially represented in the Christian coalition of 1901. Both Kuyper and Schaepman were great Hollanders. There beat in them not only Protestant and Catholic hearts, but through them surged an appreciation for the history of the Dutch people, their national aspirations, and love for the royal house. There was also a deep mutual appreciation between them which came to moving expression at the occasion of Schaepman's death in 1903 when Kuyper wired to the Vatican, "Quis non fleret. . . ." ("Who would not weep. . . .").

With the rise of the Catholic party the Catholic pillar of Dutch society was erected. By the formation of the positively Protestant and Catholic parties the previously existing political organizations automatically became pronouncedly humanistic. It is in this way that the present three-pillar constellation came into being. Of many other things that could profitably be said, I want to say or, rather, repeat only this, and to say it with the greatest emphasis, because it is the heart, center and essence of the reason that brought the Protestant pillar into being: It did *not* arise because of a "principle" that God must be served and "therefore" there must be Christian organization in public life. That is the way the plea for separate Christian organization is usually made among us. On the contrary, the principle of action that motivated Groen and Kuyper was born of and formulated in a very concrete situation in which separate Christian organization was necessary, was inescapable, was unavoidable, if the life that they and their contemporaries wanted to live as Christian men and women, not only in the home and in the Church, but in the public area of life, was to be and remain possible. In short, the historical factor gave relevance to the religious factor. Without the historical factor the religious factor would also have received expression, but differently.

What's Your Pillar?

THE DUTCH are consistent people. Give them the premises and they will draw the conclusions. The successful formation of political parties on Protestant and Catholic bases provided the Dutch Christians with a premise that they are still exploring and exploiting. If Christian principles can be worked out in the political area, should they not be worked out in other areas? The answer has been a rather unanimous Yes. With the giving of this answer something began to come into being that is as amazing to an outsider as i is natural for the Hollander. It is th well-nigh complete "verzuiling" or pil larization of the country's life. Ther was a neutral labor organization. Ther came into being Protestant and Catholi labor organizations. There was only neutral press. There came into bein an extensive Protestant and Catholi press. And so it went in increasin measure with the schools, universities employer associations, athletic associa tions, radio, farmers and gardeners, an what not more. Just about everybod sits on one pillar or another.

It might be thought that in such situation every group lives in an ai tight compartment and that these thre mutually sealed off wholes constitut the Dutch Ship of State. No conclusio could possibly be more erroneous. Even Protestant, Catholic and Humanist a Hollander in blood and bone. Every one has two centers of loyalty: th religious (even the Humanists, in co sciously choosing not to be positivel Protestant or Catholic, are religious i their central outlook), and the nationa The three pillars are therefore cemente into a sort of unity by common bloo common history, common nationalit and by love for a commonly esteeme sovereign. This unity in diversity fin expression in the saving salt of what

The Reformed Journal

VOLUME IV NO. 10

NOVEMBER, 1954

A Periodical of Reformed Comment and Opinion

EDITORIAL BOARD

Rev. Harry R. Boer, Dr. James Daane
Rev. George Stob, Dr. Henry Stob,
Dr. Henry Zylstra

Published each month by the
Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Subscription price: $2.00 per year

Entered as Second Class Matter at the Postoffice at Grand Rapids, Mich.

Address all subscriptions and communications to:

THE REFORMED JOURNAL
255 Jefferson Avenue, S. E.
Grand Rapids 3, Mich.

alled "gesprek," i.e., discussion, conerences, debates, exchanges, between roups of diverse background. And specially in the higher echelons there re those happy meetings where everyody agrees to disagree and out of this greed disagreement there arises somehow or other a national agreement hat enables the good ship Hollandia to ail happily before or courageously gainst whatever winds descend on the olitical and social seas.

It seems that the political stratificaion effected in the second half of the ineteenth century discovered to the Dutch a mode of living and working toether that suits the national mentality. find it hard to believe that the necesity leading to Christian political formaions is still so compelling as to warrant he endless separate organizations that ow exist and continue to come into eing. Many men of unquestioned hristian character feel this also and ndeavor to mitigate the sharpness f obtaining divisions. But not with a reat deal of success. And when one nquires a bit more carefully into the principial" character of many of the xisting Christian organizations he soon iscovers that not all is gold that glitrs in these social and political mounains. One thing is certain: Christian rganization in public life in Holland as not only a basis in religious conviction, but also and to no small degree n the national character and in the hisorical development of the country. We o well in America to give more atention to this than is usually done hen we talk about the need of separate hristian organization in America nder the inspiration of the Dutch exmple.

The Catholic Pillar

BUT WHY is the question of the illars so acute in Holland today? It s because earlier this year the Roman atholic hierarchy in Holland issued a anifest or "Mandement" as it is called, n the subject of "The Catholic in the ublic Life of this Time." The pastoral riting has disturbed the normally lacid Dutch political waters as they ave not been disturbed in many a oon. Among many Catholics it ocasioned perplexity, among the Socialts consternation, and among the two rge Protestant parties gleams of hope r their otherwise politically unpromisng future. What had the mitred brethen said?

Immediately after the second world war the Catholics surrendered their traditional coalition with the Protestants and buddy-buddied a coalition into being with the Socialists. The drive and imagination that the new government showed was largely provided by the Socialists under the leadership of their amiable and politically astute "Papa" Drees. Something like a Dutch New Deal was brought into being which in spite of Protestant demurrings has guided Holland to substantial prosperity and established the Socialists as the leading political group in the country. Gradually Protestant demurring ceased and a couple years ago the government base was broadened by the inclusion of some Protestants in the cabinet, two of which are Anti-revolutionaries.

The whole development gave the bishops much concern. One third of Catholic voting power was being siphoned off to other parties and the bulk of it went to the Socialists. The increasing tempo of defection burdened the pastoral hearts so heavily that they decided to do something about it. Now when bishops of the Roman Catholic Church decide to do something about a matter things are apt to happen. So here. With a complete ignoring of the long and uncritical Catholic cooperation with the Socialists they issued early this year a public declaration warning the Catholic sheep against the Socialist and Humanist leaven. The first thirty-nine pages of their publication are a persuasive exposition of Catholic social and political principle. It is so good that Anti-revolutionaries can and do underwrite it almost in toto. The sting and real intent of the writing lies in the last five pages. In view of the danger in which Catholic interest in the Socialistic program places these principles the bishops forbid under sanction of ecclesiastical discipline that any Catholic listen regularly to the program of the humanistic pillar as it comes to expression over the radio. He may not regularly read humanistic magazines, nor may he be a member of a socialistic labor or related organization. May Catholics remain members of the socialistic Labor Party? May they vote for it? The courage of the bishops and their concern for the spiritual welfare of the sheep stopped short at this dynamite-laden point. Here they do no more than point out the dangers of this association and political support. Even so, the bishops trust that "it will be plain to every one what the bishops intend and ask."

A storm of debate was unleashed by this publication. Would the coalition break up? Would Catholics stomach this treatment like immature children? Would the old Protestant-Catholic coalition again come into being? Dear reader, you do not know the power of Dutch "gesprek." One day last week Parliament took up the delicate subject. Heavy, heavy words, were spoken. The chips were down. Anything could happen. The next day the leading figures again faced each other. Prof. Romme spoke conciliatory words for the Catholic side. Mr. Burger, for the Socialists, did not feel that the cleft had gone as deeply as many surmised. "Papa" Drees felt that the cabinet could not really say anything about the matter. He also stated that the proposed reduction in taxes would probably go into effect a half year earlier than had been planned. And that, politically, ended that.

The Three Pillars In America

WHEN an American votes the Democratic or the Republican ticket he does not by so doing express a religious confession. He expresses a political, an economic view but not a religious one. His vote should be religious in the sense that he acts responsibly before God, but his vote does not indicate a preference for a religiously based political party. In the Netherlands the situation is wholly different. Entering a voting booth is a religious act. It is this in a two-fold sense. A man who votes for a Protestant party not only declares himself to be a Protestant of a particular hue, but also, and no less, as not being a Humanist or a Catholic. It must be more clearly understood among us than it is that the Christion political parties in the Netherlands are not only a positive expression of Christian principles, but also and emphatically a reaction to the Humanism that was unwilling to give to Christians a place in the public life in the country when it had the power to deny them this place.

The question that we face in America is this: Is it necessary and right to endeavor, even in principle, to bring into being the kind of religio-political division that exists in Holland? Must we endeavor to do so in the social area? More concretely, must we try to bring into being in America a situation in

The Three Pillars — Continued

which it is not possible for a good Protestant to vote for men like Alfred E. Smith, a Catholic, Herbert Lehman, a Jew, Adlai Stevenson, a Unitarian, Ezra Benson, a Mormon? These men and many more like them have been or are great Americans, symbols of public integrity. They are the kind of men who maintain the dignity of our government and the prestige of our country at home and abroad. Is it a requirement of faith that I, to the best of my ability, try to bring into being a state of things in which conscientious Protestants must inevitably dissociate themselves politically from them and their kind? I do not believe that it is. To endeavor to bring such a situation into being means to try to undo the history of our country, to effect a social and political revolution without parallel in our annals. If Christian competence were in every way being suppressed in our public life the Christian populace would have to take counsel and act. But until it becomes more evident to me than it now is that this is our situation, I decline even in my thinking to desire the kind of change that lies implicit in the claim that it is the requirement of Christian faith to effect in every area separate Christian organization.

Before those among us who have recently come from the Netherlands begin to demand that we must do in America what their fathers have done in Holland they should study more fully than they appear to have done both the history of Christian organization in Holland and the history of the growth of American institutions. I realize that even the most hopeful among them have little expectation of effecting a great deal in the direction they suggest in any concrete manner. That is not now immediately to the point, however. What is to the point is that it has more than once occurred that those in our Reformed community who have disagreed with their views were not regarded as wholly loyal to the principles of the faith they confess. I venture to suggest that this is a serious matter. To come to more mutual understanding and forebearance here would be no small gain. I do not wish to suggest that we should be indifferent to the effectuation of Christian principles in public life. I do wish to suggest that the Dutch pattern for doing so does not seem to me to be a fruitful pattern to effect the end in view.

During the two years that I have studied in Holland I have spoken with a number of men who are deeply interested in the development and application of the Reformed faith in America. I have attended a number of conferences in which the most outstanding leaders of the Anti-revolutionary party endeavored to make plain to American and South African Reformed students the principles of Anti-revolutionary statecraft. I have attended these meetings with the greatest profit and appreciation. I would like to emphasize, however, that *in all the contacts which I have had I have never met a responsible, a recognized leader who undertook to lay it upon us as a requirement of faith that we do in our country what has been done so fruitfully in Holland.* Some of whom I know that their conviction and commitment would constrain them to lay such a burden upon us if they could possibly do so, shrink back from assuming this responsibility because of their inadequate knowledge of the concrete situation and of the historical development in the countries concerned. This applies with especial reference to the American scene. Others have deliberately warned against an imitation of Dutch ways in America. And all of them display a sympathy for the difficulties and complexity involved in making Christian principles bear on public life in America.

The Way to Theology

by ROBERT OTTEN*

THE IMMEDIATE occasion for these remarks is the appearance of the first volumes of the "Library of Christian Classics." The plan of this series is, according to Prospectus, to include important writings in translation from the Patristic period through the English Reformers. There are two assumptions implicit in this undertaking, and these I should like to examine. The first is that there is a significant body of Christian theological literature worth our attention, and the second is that this body of literature can be adequately understood and justly appreciated through English translation.

* * *

THE FIRST of these assumptions is not likely to be contested by anyone. Indeed, the number of translations of the Apostolic Fathers, the Patristics, and the leading Mediaevals is increasing, and shows, if nothing else, that there is a ready market for these works in translation. In addition to the "Library of Christian Classics" — a Protestant venture — there are two Catholic series of translations in progress: "Fathers of the Church" and "Ancient Christian Writers." A Belgian firm is publishing the "Bibliothéque Augustinienne," which includes the Latin text with the French translation, while the "Sources Chretiennes" (Paris) is constantly adding new volumes to its already impressive list of early Christian writers. Finally, the massive new enterprise, the "Corpus Christianorum" would never have been undertaken had there been no evidence of the need and desire for new editions which embody the techniques and fruits of modern textual and critical scholarship. And these are just the most recent attempts to make available the literary remains of the early centuries of the Church.

I say, it is not likely that anyone will deny the validity of this first assumption, especially not if he takes the Church seriously. For the Church is more than merely another historical fact; it is nothing less than the continuation of Christ's body on earth. Superior in origin and nobility to all other organizations, it will continue beyond them, for it is perhaps the greatest of all temporal realities. Thus church history is not an antiquarian pursuit, but the record of the Holy Spirit promised by the Lord of the Church. If the history of the Church counts to us as Christians, it does so especially as Reformed Christians: the concept of the *corpus Christianum* provides the back

* Mr. Otten is Instructor in Classical Languages at Calvin College.

round of all Reformation theologies. They all assume it. That is, the Reformation is inexplicable except in terms of its antecedents; to know it we must understand of what in the Church this movement was a reformation. The work of Calvin and the other Reformers takes on meaning when we know Augustine, Ambrose, Gregory, Aquinas. A knowledge of these men will provide a large and deep understanding of the Reformation. A just estimate of the Reformers' efforts requires acquaintanceship with their predecessors; to claim a knowledge of Calvin without a knowledge of the Mediaevals is impudence as well as madness.

Now, our tradition, Christian, Protestant, Calvinistic, is Western. The doctrines we embrace are the products of the Western Christian mind, and behind them all stands the work of men thinking in *Latin.* The theological development and explication of the basic creeds were elaborated by the Latin theologians from Tertullian through Calvin. It is in terms set by these men that our modern theological problems are raised. To know ourselves we must know our past, and to know our past we must know this Western Christian mind. And this means knowing *Latin.* T. H. Huxley, commenting on Mediaeval education in his essay *Science and Education,* says: ". . . .the way to theology lay through Latin." That judgment may not stand today in its entirety, but surely it must still be recognized that the way to a millenium of theology still lies through Latin.

* * *

AND THIS brings me to the second assumption mentioned above, that this body of Latin theology can be reliably understood through English translation. It is this assumption which few are ready to question these days when Chaucer has to be properly englished and degrees in philosophy are given to candidates who lack even an elementary knowledge of Greek. In the case of ecclesiastical and theological history it is obviously better that some knowledge be gained through translation from the original than that none be gained at all. Translations provide a medium for those whose interest is non-professional or non-specialized. But here I am concerned with those people whose business is theology, the professional theologian and the clergyman.

Of these two, the former will not neglect his Latin. Indeed, he will not be a theologian without it, just as he will not if he cannot read Hebrew or Greek. As a specialist, he will at all moments of his theologizing be treading the steps of the Fathers, re-examining and scrutinizing over and over again their treatises, going back to them for illumination and guidance. The Mediaeval and the Reformed Theologians will be constantly open before him, for he will see in them the setting for many of the contemporary theological issues. He will attempt the study of no period without seeing its antecedents, will enter upon no piece of research without satisfying himself that he has before him in authentic form the sources which it is his business to treat. He realizes that the very nature of the theological enterprise demands comprehension, and that this comprehension is to be attained partially, at least, through this deep and intimate knowledge of Latin theology. The scientific character of his field demands that his basic tools include the best texts available of whatever author he may be treating, and his own sense of scholarship will be violated if he cannot verify and check his findings with the words of the author himself. He realizes that if facts are to be reliably established and responsibly developed, he will have to make constant references to the sources. The theologian is not the one to take his languages, including Latin, lightly; they are fundamental to his endeavor.

BUT IT IS among the clergy that the danger of neglect is to be found. Faced with all the demands of their practical work, they can find little enough time to keep informed of current movements in religion and theology, let alone developing some learned interest in a field such as is offered by the Latin theological works. And yet, their office requires a live and vivid sense of the Church and its history. The Church in its struggles for truth in dogma and clarity in doctrine must live in them. It concerns them not as impartial observers, but interested participants; they must sum up in themselves the Church and its past. It is for this reason that they should have a direct, if fragmentary, contact with the greatest thinkers of the Church, that these be their constant companions and guides.

Early Church history must be more than a matter of ecclesiastical antiquities; rather than Harnacks they must be Newmans, in whose mind the fourth century lived as a contemporary event, and who saw the Arian heresy as a persistent spiritual threat. This solid knowledge of the early and mediaeval Church will help to prevent static conception of the Church; it will provide a vital and authentic contact with the Church in progress — with its origin, its sojourn up till now, its End. The study of the Latin originals will force the reader to reflect on the perennial issues, and will fix his mind on problems which have in one form or another troubled the Church. The danger of provincialism, whether local or temporal, will be obviated by providing a context, by affording a perspective. Spiritual poise and intellectual balance are the fruits of such a discipline. We cannot, and do not, expect of the clergy the erudition and scholarship which we can rightfully demand of the theologian; but surely the minimum requirement is theological literacy, and it is this end which the study of ecclesiastical Latin serves. Nourished on the best in the Christian tradition, ministers can pursue theology in a significant way. Somewhere in their curriculum room must be made for intensive study of Latin so that they can, by the time they are ready for their practical work as pastors approach with competence and some degree of assurance those authors whose theology has been preserved in the Latin tongue.

It's Renewal Time . . .

for your REFORMED JOURNAL Subscription. Look for the special Reformed Journal Reading Club book offers coming to you in the mail soon.

God's Way With the Jews

by ALBERT HUISJEN*

THE apostle Paul, the apostle who was especially commissioned as the apostle of the Gentiles, has thrown more light on God's way with the Jews, concerning their salvation, than any other New Testament writer. It was Paul, in fact, who gave the Church her directives concerning her mission to the Jews. At first thought it would seem that these directives should have come from Peter because Peter was especially named as the apostle of the circumcision. There was a good reason, however, why these came from Paul. As the apostle of the Gentiles, Paul was to establish the Church as a body of believers called out from all peoples, and it was this body of believers whom God would use to bring the Jews under the ministry of the Gospel. Paul plainly tells us that he used his office as the apostle of the Gentiles to that end. He says for instances, "For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office: if by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh, and might save some of them," Romans 11:13-14. Paul magnified his office as the apostle of the Gentiles in that he sought to build up the Church in faith and godliness so that she might deport herself as having inherited God's promises once given to Israel and thus provoke the Jews to emulate her.

Now observe that when Paul speaks of provoking the Jews to jealousy or emulation, he is bringing to the fore a feature in God's way with the Jews which is central and basic. Paul twice more speaks of this provocation in Romans, in 10:19 and in 11:11. There Paul says, "But I say, did Israel not know? First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish nation I will anger you," and "I say then have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall salvation is come to the Gentiles for to provoke them to jealousy."

Now considering our subject in the light of these Scripture passages and in the light of the contexts in which they are found, we cannot very well escape the conclusion that God's way with the Jews concerning their salvation involves us in several ways. Observe that it involves us in: a divine provision; a particular relationship; a unique mission; and a godly deportment.

A Divine Provision

IN bringing to the fore the feature of provocation to jealousy Paul takes his stand on the prophetic words of the Lord God spoken by the mouth of Moses. These are found in Deuteronomy 32, the chapter which comprises the Song of Moses. Paul quotes from verse 21, which in the King James version reads, "They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God, they have provoked me to anger with their vanities: I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people; I will provoke them to anger by a foolish nation." Now the provocation and jealousy spoken of here are not to be understood as having evil connotations. This is clear from the usage Paul makes of them. The jealousy spoken of here is not a jealousy which tends to evil doing but rather to vigilent solicitude. In Romans 11:14 it is translated, "emulation," and it has that meaning. A Holland translation brings out this meaning by using the term "ijver." Likewise the provocation spoken of here is one that does not tend towards vengeance but rather towards action for good. Paul speaks of this provocation and jealousy as means which tend towards the salvation of the Jews. In other words, these prophetic words of the Lord are not prophecies of God's judgments upon Israel but prophecies of chastisements for their good, prophecies which envision the salvation of the Jews.

Whatever else the import of this Scripture portion might be, it is clear that God here spoke of raising up a people unto himself whom He would use to provoke the Jews to jealousy concerning their salvation. It should also be clear that the people whom God would raise up for this purpose are none other than the Christian people. No other people could possibly serve this purpose of God. There have been times that God used other peoples to chastise Israel, but to provoke them to jealousy concerning their salvation, only a people can do who have become God's people indeed. From this prophetic word of the Lord God we must conclude that our being raised up to provoke the Jews to jealousy concerning their salvation was as much determined by God as was our salvation. In this Old Testament Scripture lies the embryo of Jewish evangelism, the precursor of our mission to the Jews!

Our involvement in this divine provision becomes very significant in the light of the context of this Scripture. What Paul quoted is part of the Song of Moses. It is part of the song which God commanded Moses to write and teach the people. A casual reader might get the impression that this is a song of judgment and punishment, but it is not. Although it brings the judgments of God upon Israel into strong focus, this is primarily a song of deliverance. Israel's sins are many and grievous but in the end there is deliverance. In verse 43 the nations are called upon to rejoice with God's people because of their deliverance. Paul in Romans 15:9-10 clearly refers to this song when speaking of the salvation of both Jews and Gentiles he says, "Rejoice ye Gentiles with his people." God has not forgotten to be merciful; He has purposed that the Jews shall obtain mercy through our mercy. Of this Paul says: "For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief: even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they might also obtain mercy." When Paul envisioned the wonderful provision which God had made in behalf of the salvation of both Gentiles and Jews and how the one was subservient to the other, he broke forth with rapturous admiration saying, "O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out."

Need we give more evidence of the significance of our involvement in God's way with the Jews? Then consider that in Rev. 15:3 we read, "And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God and the song of the Lamb." Heaven resounds with this song of Moses because among others the redeemed of Israel according to the flesh are also there.

This Scripture not only tells us that

* Mr. Huisjen has for many years been missionary to the Jews and is now Field Missionary of the Christian Reformed Church in Community Jewish Evangelism.

ve are involved in a divine provision oncerning the Jews; it tells us that this nvolvement will work unto their sal- ation.

A Particular Relationship

GOD'S way with the Jews con- erning their salvation also involves us n a particular relationship with them, a elationship such as is not found be- ween us and other peoples.

First, we are particularly related to he Jews in that our salvation is closely ntertwined with them. Paul speaks of his in Romans 11:11 when he says, 'Have they then stumbled that they hould fall? God forbid: but rather hrough their fall salvation is come to he Gentiles for to provoke them to ealousy." The fall of the Jews was ubservient to our salvation and our alvation, in turn, is to be subservient o their salvation. The Jews have fal- en, but there was an over-ruling pur- ose in their fall and this over-ruling urpose envisioned both our salvation nd theirs. We do well to ponder this lainly revealed truth of Scripture. Too asily and too often we feel and act as hough the fall of the Jews were an end n itself. Also, too easily and too often ve feel and act as though our salvation vere an end in itself; we feel that we eed have no care whatsoever for the alvation of the Jews, or for the salva- on of anyone else. We perhaps can gnore this relationship but we cannot y any manner of means void it.

Second, we are particularly related to he Jews in that both they and we are ranches of one root. They are the atural branches, we are the ingrafted. 'aul speaks of this relationship at length n Romans 11:16-24. Among other hings Paul warns us not to boast gainst the Jews. God is able to graft hem in again. Says Paul, "For if thou vert cut out of the olive tree which is vild by nature, and wert grafted con- rary to nature into a good olive tree: ow much more shall these, which be he natural branches, be grafted into heir own olive tree?" To such as are nclined to boast against the Jews — nd of such there are not a few — we vould say, consider the figure of speech vhich the apostle uses here. In horti- ulture an ingrafted branch retains its wn nature quite consistently and bears he fruit of its original stock. Now night this here not mean that a Jew, be- ng a natural branch, really has the ad- antage? Is this not perhaps what 'aul tells us elsewhere? Notice what Paul says in Romans 3:1-2, "What advantage then hath a Jew or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." From where then comes the idea that it is harder for the Jew to be converted than for others? But whoever might have the advantage, also this Scripture tells us that we bear a very particular relationship to the Jews.

The most relevant point in our relationship to the Jews, however, is found in Romans 11:17. There we read, "What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it." Here we have just such a relationship as naturally genders jealousy. We have inherited that which was first promised to the Jews and which they believe they should have. The Jews indeed have a rich heritage by promise of God. Paul describes this heritage when he says, "To whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises." The Jews are not devoid of a knowledge of these promises nor of a feeling for them, but in their selfrighteousness they have not obtained them. Now when Paul tells us that the election hath obtained it, he has reference to none other than those whom the Lord has called unto Himself in Christ Jesus. By profession we are the members of the body of Christ; we are the elect. Hence, we are the people whom God would use to provoke the Jews to emulation and we are the people whom God can use to that end; our particular relationship with them involves our doing so.

Although not as specifically set forth in Scripture, but clearly by the providence of God, we are involved in still another meaningful relation to the Jews. They are our neighbors in a true sense of that word. We and they are scattered abroad in the same world, the same countries, the same provinces, the same cities, the same communities. We are so scattered because of our belief in Christ Jesus, they, because of their disbelief of Him. It had long before been foretold that they would be so scattered if unbelieving. Although already partly dispersed at the time of the New Testament their full dispersion followed the rejection of Christ. But observe that the dispersion of the Jews and the progression of the Gospel has gone on side by side. Barring exceptions the Jews are dispersed in Christian lands and Christian communities. In so far as the Jews have lived in segregation it has been the intolerance of Christians and Christian churches which have given them cause. Where intolerance has given way to Christian charity the Jews have emerged from the ghetto and taken their place in Christian communities. Increasingly therefore, we find ourselves side by side with the Jews today. Thousands upon thousands actually reside in the shadow of Christian churches, and our Church also has its quota. Do we need proof that this is meaningful? Then consider the answer which Jesus gave to the man who asked him, And who is my neighbor? Too often have Christians and Christian churches left the Jew lying in his blood, yes, even sought to put him out of their sight.

A Unique Mission

GOD'S way with the Jews further involves us in a unique mission in their behalf. Now someone might object that this cannot very well be since Scripture explicitly states that there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek. However, the "no difference" here refers to there being no difference between them before God. God is no respector of persons. The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation for the one as well as for the other. But from this it does not follow that there is no difference in the manner of our mission. The provocation to jealousy, implemented by our particular relation to them, makes our mission to the Jews unique. The Jew is provoked to jealousy or emulation when he comes to see that the Christian has truly become heir of God's promises. And this he comes to see by observing Christian life, not the Christian life of an individual Christian merely, but the collective Christian life, the life of the Church, the body of Christ.

Religiously the Jew thinks in terms of "All Israel," he does so with respect to receiving God's blessings and he does so with respect to the religious influence he might exert. He is a religious collectivist. But it is also quite certain that the provocation of which our Scripture speaks lies on the plane of the corporate or collective witness of the Church of Jesus Christ. This witness has too much and too long been lost sight of. Much of the witnessing to the Jews today, if we can call it witnessing is individualistic, a missionary or missionaries going out or being sent

God's Way With the Jews — Continued

out to interest the Jews in the Gospel as best they can, without a thought that the corporate witness of the Church has anything to do with it. One who today pleads the corporate witness of the Church as a means of bringing the Jews under the ministry of the Gospel meets with apathy and objection on every hand. On the one hand it is contended that it is too idealistic to expect the Christian churches to serve such a purpose today, and on the other hand, that the churches are not conditioned for it. Now generally speaking the latter contention is quite true. However, notwithstanding these contentions and the admission that the Church, generally speaking, is not conditioned for this mission, the history of Jewish conversions shows that God has used this means more than any other to call unto Himself such of the Jews as have been converted.

But what should a Church do about her mission to the Jews when she finds that she is not conditioned for it? Should she bypass the specific provision which the Lord God has made, circumvent her deficiency, and seek to devise other ways and means of dealing with the Jews? Or should she perhaps ignore it and drop it from her missionary program? The Church can do either, though not rightfully. She cannot void her rightful mission.

To speak of conditioning a Church is a mechanic-like way of speaking of a sacred activity but it is done so commonly that we do so here. Now Paul tells us plainly that he labored to condition the Church for her mission to the Jews. Says Paul, "For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify my office: if by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh and save some of them." Obviously, Paul was here not speaking of his labor with the Jews, but, of his labor with and in the Church in behalf of the Jews. Paul sought to build up the Church in faith and godliness so that she might the better answer to her high calling with respect to the Jews. To do this was a part of Paul's ministry as the apostle of the Gentiles. Should it not also be a part of the Christian ministry today?

A Godly Deportment

LAST but not least God's way with the Jews concerning their salvation involves us in a godly deportment. Scripture elsewhere tells us that godliness is profitable unto all things and so it is in our mission to the Jews. Without godly deportment there is no provoking the Jews to emulation. In considering this part of our subject we make our observation on the basis of Romans 9, 10 and 11.

First, if we would be godly as concerns the Jews we must be embued with a spirit of Godly compassion for them, as was the apostle Paul. Paul, observe, had great heaviness and continual sorrow in his heart for he could wish himself accursed from Christ for his brethren, his kinsmen according to the flesh. In writing about this Paul was not first of all expressing his personal feelings, he was writing by inspiration of God. This heaviness of heart and sorrow was not chiefly born of the flesh, it was born of the spirit. Paul was awakened to their sad plight when he became a believer and follower of Christ. As to being accursed from Christ for them, that was not necessary. Christ long before had been made a curse for sin and this could also avail Paul's kinsmen. But Paul breathed the spirit of Christ. Paul as it were thought God's thoughts after Him, for God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son.

As for the Jews, they need our compassion, not our scorn. The judgments of God rest very heavily upon them. Having received much from the Lord God, much shall be required from them. Having known the will of the Lord and not having done accordingly, they shall be beaten with many stripes. God's judgments upon the Jews in their unbelief are heavier than upon any other people. There is evidence in this Scripture that Paul was conscious of this and was deeply moved by it.

Second, if we would be godly as concerns the Jews it must also be our hearts' desire and prayer to God for Israel that they may be saved. To the Church at Rome and to the Church of all times Paul wrote, "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they may be saved." Now it might be understood that Paul here was merely informing the Church that he was praying for the salvation of the Jews. But are we not rather to understand this as an exhortation unto prayer for their salvation? What immediately follows on these words of Paul gives us a good reason to believe that the latter was the case. There were those in the Church at Rome who reasoned that the Jews had become a disobedient and gainsaying people, that they had stumbled in order that they should fall, that they like unfruitful branches had been broken off, that they were enemies of the Gospel and that God had cast them off. With such reasoning there would naturally be little or no prayer for them. Yet like reasoning has pervaded much of the Church down through the centuries, and still pervades her. In the matter of prayer for the salvation of the Jews, more than in any other matter concerning them, has the Church failed in her mission. How can we, in the light of this Scripture, be godly in our deportment concerning the Jews if we do not pray for their salvation?

Third, if we would be godly concerning the Jews we must be guided, not by our intuition or feelings, but by the Word of God. The reasoning mentioned above might be rational but it is not Biblical. To those who thus reason Paul says, "I say then hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I am also an Israelite . . . God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew." Then, taking his stand upon the Scripture, Paul brings Elias into the picture and says, "Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias?" Paul had recourse to the Old Testament but we have recourse to both, the Old and the New Testament.

What saith the Scripture? It tells us that on Pentecost 3,000 Jews were converted and baptized. A little later it tells us that the number grew to 5,000. Then we also read, "And the Lord added daily to the church such as should be saved," the latter was said about the Church at Jerusalem, therefore, these were all Jewish. What shall we say to these things? Surely God has not cast off the Jews! No reason whatsoever why we should assume a "not much use" attitude towards Jewish evangelism.

Wot ye not what the Scripture saith? "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance. For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief: Even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they may also obtain mercy," Romans 11: 29-31. God's way with the Jews as concerning their salvation involves us in a mission, and it is a purposeful and glorious mission. But are we faithful

CIVIC GOOD

by CLIFTON J. ORLEBEKE*

One encouraging aspect of the recent discussions of common grace is the agreement by almost all hands (excepting, obviously, the Protestant Reformed) that such a thing does exist. The differences, such as they are, usually center either about the *relative importance* or the *exact meaning* of this doctrine. Of these, the latter is logically first, and therefore has rightly claimed most of the attention.

In this article I wish to say something about the meaning of a single concept in our received doctrine of common grace. The concept is "civic good," as it appears in the third part of the Synodical declaration of 1924. I shall quote it in full:

> Concerning the third point, touching the performance of so-called civic righteousness by the unregenerate, Synod declares that according to Scripture and the Confession the unregenerate, though incapable of any saving good (Canons of Dort, III, IV, 3) can perform such civic good. This is evident from the quoted Scripture passages and from the Canons of Dort, III, IV, 4, and the Belgic Confession, where it is taught that God, without renewing the heart, exercises such influences upon man that he is enabled to perform civic good; while it is evident from the quoted declarations of Reformed writers of the period of florescence of Reformed theology, that our Reformed fathers have from of old championed this view.

The first thing to notice about this statement is its element of negation: Synod took great pains to reject the erroneous belief that unregenerate people could perform no good acts whatsoever. Positively, Synod asserted that the unregenerate can perform a *kind* of good called *civic* good, in distinction from *real* or *saving* good. But what is this civic good? If it is good, why is it not really good? Is there some touchstone or criterion according to which we can distinguish these modes of goodness?

Certainly this is not a mere academic puzzle. What thinking Christian has not wondered, even trembled, at the comparison of his works with those of people whom he believes to be destined to eternal perdition? Can he say that lives of great self-sacrifice, such as Albert Schweitzer's[1], show only "civic" righteousness, while his own social and religious behavior (which, very likely, clashes little with the pattern of his social and religious community) examplifies *real* good? If he does, what content can he put into it?

* * *

The goodness of an act can be ascertained according to several useful standards. We might say, for example, that an act is good because (1) it conforms with the moral law, or because (2) it has beneficial results, or because (3) it springs from worthy intentions and motives, or because (4) it is performed by a good man. Let us scrutinize the notion of "civic good" under each of these heads.

(1) Can the unregenerate perform acts which conform to the moral law? There is no doubt that they can and do perform such acts. A single passage from St. Paul is sufficient as evidence, where he speaks of ". . . the Gentiles . . . (doing) by nature the things contained in the law" (Rom. 2:14). Calvin, too, speaks of unbelievers who ". . . have not only been eminent for noble actions, but have uniformly conducted themselves in a most virtuous manner through the whole course of their lives" (*Institutes,* II, III, 3). Other distinguished Reformed authors, such as Ursinus and Van Mastricht, were quoted by Synod to the same effect.

The Canons of Dort add a careful qualification, however, in saying that the natural man shows "some regard for virtue and for good *outward* behavior" (III, IV, 4, italics mine). Does this "outwardness" destroy the force of our thesis? For an answer we may turn to Berkhof, who distinguishes the *material goodness* of the unbeliever's acts from their formal insufficiency (the latter meaning that they do not spring from the right motive and do not aim at the right purpose).[2] But our present concern is precisely with that "material" conformity to the divine moral law — not with motive or purpose. We may conclude that civic good does, indeed, exhibit this conformity.

* * *

(2) Shall we say, then, that good works performed by the unregenerate fail to have beneficial effects? This would be paradoxical. How could acts which are commanded by God have adverse effects, either upon the agent or upon the objects toward which he directed them? St. Paul could even rejoice about the effects of those who preached Christ insincerely and spitefully (Phil. 1:15-18), and the Old Testament speaks approvingly of the deeds done by Jehu, Jehoash, and others. But let us be more contemporary: he who would deny the good consequences of faithful police duty, by believer or unbeliever, must surely accept the burden of proof.

The choice of the adjective "civic" to describe the good works of unbelievers is highly instructive on this point.[3] It shows that those who used it were thinking of the preservation of human society as a *beneficial effect* of these works. It is, further, in keeping with our whole understanding of the divine economy to believe that God, by His common grace as well as His special grace, enables men to glorify Him in acts which will promote the historical process in accordance with His plan.

* * *

(3) It is apparent, then, that "civic good" conforms to the moral law and has beneficial results. In both of these senses it is really good and not evil. But can we also say this about the *motivation* of such acts? Or must we assert that, whatever their outward nature and consequences, all "good acts" done by unbelievers spring from unworthy motives?

This appears to be a reasonable solution. In the doctrine of total depravity we hold that the unregenerate heart is fundamentally hateful — toward God and fellow men alike. Must we not say, then, that even those acts which we call "outwardly good" spring from "in-

---

* Mr. Orlebeke is a graduate student of Philosophy at Harvard University.

1 I do not presume to judge the state of Dr. Schweitzer's soul. I use him only as an example of one who gives no evidence of orthodox Christian faith, yet lives a remarkably dedicated life.

2 *Systematic Theology,* p. 443.

3 From another point of view the choice of this adjective is not so happy, since Christians are also commanded to do civic good (that is, good works directed toward the welfare of society).

wardly evil" motives? That the friendly greeting from the milk man, the heroic child-rescue by a veteran, the munificent philanthropy of an industrialist, are in truth prompted by selfish desires for power, acclaim, or worldly goods?

Such argumentation is attractive and plausible, but it requires a closer look. Let us, for contrast, examine the nature of really good works, those which are required of the believing Christian. The answer to Question 91 of the Heidelberg Catechism describes them as "only those which are done from true faith, according to the law of God, and to His glory; and not such as are based on our own opinions or the precepts of men." Accepting the definition without comment, let us ask the previous question about believers: are all "good" acts done by them motivated by true faith, in obedience to the law of God, and dedicated to His glory? Or, perhaps, are some done because they seem proper, decent, or even advisable in view of a nearby police officer?

A moment's reflection will reveal that none of these questions are answered easily. One is likely to say about the unbeliever, for instance, that *of course* he may have kindly and unselfish intentions, but they are superficial, merely apparent, not deep enough, or the like. Contrariwise, it may be alleged that Christians certainly don't always *consciously* seek to do their Christian duty, but *basically* they *try* to do so in their whole lives.

Thus we are brought, inevitably, to a distinction something like Freud's between conscious and unconscious reasons for an act. We would like to say that some motives are only impulses or even self-deceptions, while others are fundamental and real. And this appears to be true. One need not endorse the whole of modern "depth psychology" to acknowledge that such techniques as free association, dream interpretation, and hypnosis have revealed much about the mysteriously hidden part of human personality. Never before have we been so aware that a person can be grossly ignorant of the real reasons for his own and other people's behavior.

But what of our question? Can we differentiate an act of civic good from an act of saving good by using the criterion of motive? It hardly seems so. If we attempt to limit consideration to conscious motives only, we face the objection that we are dealing with superficialities, rationalizations, and the like. If an unbeliever should claim that he gives blood to the Red Cross solely from love for his fellow man, may we believe him? If not, may we then believe a Christian who makes the same claim? The two are on the same level.

Suppose, then, that we attempt to analyze the deeper motives. We may say that this same unbeliever really gives blood because of obsessive guilt-feelings which, unknown to him, compel him to shed his own blood. Such is the power of sin in his inner man. But this, again, is not adequate as a criterion for the chief reason that no person, Christian or non-Christian, is free from this power of sin in his inward self. Mental and spiritual abnormalities are not infallible hallmarks of the unregenerate, and no Christian who has the courage to study himself and his Bible dares to claim that he is free of illicit desires and motives. How, then, can he distinguish his really good acts from the civic good of his neighbor by an appeal to motives?

The truth of the matter shows greys, not black and white. It requires rather extreme foolhardiness to dismiss every altruistic act, by Christian or non-Christian, as being basically selfish. Even worse would be a claim by the Christian that his acts ever found their origin in wholly worthy motives. We must say, then, that motivation is not a very successful criterion of civic good; at best it can be applied relatively.

* * *

(4) A fourth alternative remains to be explored in our attempt to describe civic good. It is, I think, more helpful than any of those which preceded. The moral worth of an act can be evaluated not only in isolation, with respect to laws, consequences, or motives; it can also be set into a larger context — that is, considered as one behavioral aspect of a man whose life has a basic tendency and goal.

In an important sense, all human beings seek to do that which is good. They are confronted with a multitude of such goods, between which they must choose. Transcending them all, and often scarcely observed, is the Supreme Good—the God Whom all men need, and without Whom all other goods are in the end vain.

In rejecting God, Adam (and all of us in him) chose vanity. Man and the world were declared good enough by themselves, and the consequence was that both fell into the bondage of sin. Without God, the capability for excellence and virtue was lost.

The good news of Christianity is a message of grace from the rejected Creator to His fallen world. He did not leave us with the consequences of our sin, but saved us from them with incredible compassion. To some He has given the key to a truly good life through regeneration. Others, who persist in rejecting Him, He has preserved from the full effects of human depravity, and enabled to perform many good acts. Neither have any claim upon Him, but must rely solely upon His grace.

The Christian is renewed in spirit. He is, in principle, a good man. His life, on this earth, is a struggle to fulfill that which he already is. By God's grace he travels the right road. The unbeliever is not renewed in spirit. According to the good pleasure of God, he persists in traveling the wrong road. Yet, in this life, he may be enabled to live virtuously. He may contribute nobly to the well-being of others, that God may be glorified in spite of his unbelief.

What, then, is civic good? It is the good which unregenerate people perform. It is different from saving good neither because it flaunts God's law, nor has adverse effects, nor because the motives from which it springs are clearly worse than those of the Christian. Its deficiency is in its deepest source: a heart which does not love the God of goodness, which is not, in its basic tendency, directed toward His glory. The good which proceeds from such a heart is limited to lesser things, falling short of the complete end of man. It is not sufficient for salvation, and in this sense is ultimately worthless for him who has nothing else to offer.

The Christian is not permitted to rest content with the fact that unregenerate people can perform acts of civic good. He must preach the Christ Who transforms the whole man, Who can set him on the road to perfection. Without Christ, the "one thing needful" is lacking. But neither may the Christian condemn everything that the unregenerate person does. He must acknowledge that which is good, and add his influence to prosper it. There are lesser goods which are worth having. The duty of the Christian is not to shun but to encourage; not to judge, but to love.

Geerhardus Vos

by JACOB G. VANDEN BOSCH

If for a biographer it is desirable that he be personally acquainted with his subject, then I am at a distinct disadvantage, for I had no personal acquaintance with Dr. Geerhardus Vos till the late years of his life, and even then my acquaintance was but slight. If, however, to have seen and heard him counts for something in vitalizing the data gathered from various sources, I can claim some advantage. Early one Monday morning of August, 1890, he accompanied our pastor to visit our farm home which had been invaded by death and in which there still was serious illness. When I was in my teens I occasionally heard him preach and remember being impressed with his prayers which to me were tender and beautiful rather than with his sermons which were too profound for my young mind. To have seen greatness in human form has always been thought to be noteworthy. I think it was a certain Roman author who, when he had on one occasion caught a glimpse of the great epic poet of his nation, elatedly wrote that he had seen Virgil. Well, I have had more than a glimpse of my Virgil.

Though born in Heerenveen, Friesland, Geerhardus Vos was of German parentage, son of Rev. J. H. Vos and Kaltje Beuker, whose original home was the Graafschap Bentheim, commonly known as merely Graafschap. A tradition persisted that the Vos family was descended from the French Huguenots, the name being Vossé, who fled from France to Holland after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. But this seems to have been no more than an unconfirmed tradition; at any rate, the members of the Vos family were always conscious of their German descent. To be told that Professor Henricus Beuker was his uncle may perhaps serve to bring the subject nearer to the reader.

Geerhardus Vos was born March 14, 1862. His secondary education he received at the gymnasiums of Schiedam and Amsterdam, from the latter of which he graduated with honors at the age of nineteen. In 1881 he came to America with his father who had accepted a call to the Spring Street Church. A theological education being his goal, that same fall he enrolled as a student in the "Theologische School," and here, together with E. Broene, R. Drukker, and P. Ekster, he completed his course of study in 1883. During his last year he also was an instructor in the literary department. Upon graduation he was offered a full time position to assist Professor Boer, which he declined.

Instead of teaching or entering the ministry, Mr. Vos desired to continue his theological studies at Princeton. The choice of seminary was a commendable one, for in those days Princeton was a bulwark of the Reformed faith, and its faculty was composed of scholarly men such as Alexander A. Hodge, who taught dogmatics, William Henry Green, renowned Old Testament scholar, and Francis Landey Patton, of brilliant apologetic fame. Here he remained two years, from 1883 to 1885, and won a fellowship in Hebrew by writing a thesis on *The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes,* which was published in 1886 with an introduction by Professor Green. To avail himself of the provisions of this fellowship he spent the next three years in Germany, one year at Berlin and two at Strassburg, being awarded the degree of doctor of philosophy by the university in the latter city. While he was still a student at Strassburg, he had already acquired the reputation of being a scholar of marked ability, and the Calvinists in Holland heard of it. After a conference with Dr. A. Kuyper and officials of the Free University, to which he had been invited, he was offered a professorship in Old Testament theology, and he was the first to be so honored. Meanwhile the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church which met in 1886 had called him to be professor in its theological school in spite of the fact that he was not ordained. So great confidence did Synod place in him that this hurdle was easily cleared. This appointment he had accepted, and abiding by this decision he dedicated himself to the promotion of Reformed theology in America.

The coming of Dr. Vos was an event of unusual importance in the history of our seminary. There now had joined the ranks of the teaching staff a young man only twenty-six years old, enjoying the benefits of the finest education to be had in these days and having given evidence of being a student of no mean intellectual power. He began his professorial task with an address on the subject, *The Prospects of Theology in America.* He entered upon his labors with rare devotion and endeared himself to the students by what he did for them. He taught both literary and theological subjects, and, though carrying a load of no fewer than twenty-five teaching periods a week, he found time to publish *A Hellenistic Greek Grammar* and to prepare dictations for his students in several subjects — History of Philosophy, Idololatry, Introduction to Dogmatics, and Systematic Theology. One of the requirements stipulated in the letter of call was one English sermon a week, but it seems that the coming of Rev. J. Y. De Baun to be the pastor of the newly organized church on La Grave Avenue caused this requirement to be "more honored in the breach than in the observance." But even so the church was satisfied that the young professor was an honor to the school and that his achievements were indeed amazing.

When Dr. Vos delivered his rectoral oration in 1891 on the theme, *The Doctrine of the Covenant in Reformed Theology,* which on publication was favorably noticed even by Reformed scholars in Europe, both church and students rejoiced, for he had spoken with the voice and the authority of a scholar. But their great joy was soon alarmingly disturbed. In 1892 Dr. Vos received an appointment from Princeton Seminary to be the first occupant of the newly established chair of Biblical Theology. To taste something of the mingled joy and pride the students felt when their beloved professor announced his decision to remain with them one must read the outburst of their emotions in *De Wachter* which rose to a resounding *Soli Deo Gloria.*

Alack and alas, the following year Princeton repeated its offer and Dr. Vos signified his acceptance. This decision was a serious blow to the school, from which it only slowly recovered. It was variously interpreted. Some were sure that it was to be ascribed to the opposition of a few to the supralapsarian views of Dr. Vos, an interpretation that gained credence from the fact that no one less than the revered Rev. L. J. Hulst lodged a protest against the intro-

duction into our seminary of supralapsarian teachings with their implications and the failure of curatorium to do anything about it. This explanation was rendered somewhat more plausible by the severe grilling to which G. A. De Haan and J. Groen were subjected in their final examination. But the records show that this explanation has no real basis in fact. On the one hand, Dr. Vos displayed a fine conciliatory spirit. He suggested that a fourth professor be appointed to teach the disciplines belonging to the dogmatic branches and that he retain the exegetical. Synod of 1892 did act on this advice and called Dr. N. M. Steffens of Holland, Michigan, and Professor D. K. Wielenga of Kampen, but these declined. On the other hand, Curatorium met in special session and did all in its power to persuade Dr. Vos to remain.

How almost absurd this attack on Dr. Vos because of his supralapsarian learnings seems to us today. But sixty years ago the climate of opinion was such as to make the controversy inevitable. The infras maintained that the supra conception was contrary to what our confessional standards taught. And the controversy seems absurd especially since Dr. Vos's view was not extreme. In one of his writings he went so far as to say that he would view the covenant of grace from the infra point of view since a consistent theory of the covenant could not be constructed on a supra basis.

However, public opinion in the church did not sustain this criticism. Dr. Vos's popularity stood in striking contrast to the critical attitude of a few ministers. Whenever he preached, he addressed audiences that filled every seat. He did not carry his hearers away with his eloquence, nor did he present truth so simply that the people always understood him. But he was Dr. Vos: that was enough. He was indeed a unique figure among us. Perhaps never again did like response greet him.

* * *

THE REAL REASON for Dr. Vos's acceptance seems obvious enough. He felt that he could be of greater service to Reformed theology at Princeton than at Grand Rapids. Princeton, prominent among Presbyterian seminaries, was a stronghold of the Reformed faith, counting a large number of students, and through them exerting a far flung influence. But personal considerations should not be overlooked. Working conditions would be far more favorable: the prospect of teaching none but theological courses, some of them being for only advanced students, must have been alluring. The teaching hours would be fewer and library facilities far superior. Again Princeton at this time was a center of Presbyterian culture and this fact, together with the advantages of association with men like Warfield, Green, Purves, De Witt, and Paxton, and with men from the university faculty as well, cannot but have been a silent factor in the decision that was made. Even these considerations may have been thought of as favorable to the greater influence to be exerted.

Biblical theology, a comparatively new discipline in European centers of theological education, had its birth in a rationalistic environment and was monopolized by the Liberals. It had been introduced into the curriculum of Princeton Seminary and had been receiving some attention in the existing courses in the Old and in the New Testament. Realizing that in this way justice could not be done to a subject so important, the authorities established a new chair and appointed a professor who could devote his entire time to it. Then, too, it was felt that by this arrangement Princeton strengthened its witness for orthodox Christianity in its struggle against the forces of Liberalism. To be selected for the new chair was undoubtedly a great honor, but it entailed still greater responsibility. The idea that in the revelation of Divine truth in Scripture there is traceable a line of progressive, historic development did not seem to captivate Reformed theologians. So when Dr. Vos began his labors at Princeton, he was compelled to blaze a comparatively new trail in Reformed theology, a Herculean task indeed. But he believed; therefore he spoke. Said he to one of his former students, "In the Old Country they do not believe much in Biblical Theology, but I have taught it for thirty-five years and certainly believe in it." But in the Holland of today its value is certainly being recognized, for Dr. Grosheide of the Free University in his recent book, *De Openbaring Gods in het Nieuwe Testament*, adopts the idea of historic development in revelation.

One could not sit at the feet of Dr. Vos and one cannot read his books without realizing that his competent scholarship rested on the two pillars of a great mind and the best of training. Carlyle once said that one could not help detecting a man with a great soul if only one stood with him for but five minutes under a penthouse to seek shelter from rain. One could not be in the presence of Dr. Vos and converse with him without being impressed with his learning, his incisive thinking, and his subtilty of mind. Good students admired these qualities in him. Wrote one of them in *The Banner* of September 2, 1949: "With his wonderfully keen mind, his profound insight into Scripture, and his familiarity with the original languages of the Bible, he was able to present ideas which were often amazing. His courses unearthed for the student some of the grandest thoughts of Holy Writ. How often as one sat in his classroom one could experience something of the sentiment of the disciples of Emmaus. Did not our hearts burn within us while he talked to us in his lectures, and while he opened to us the Scriptures?" Colleagues, too, appreciated Dr. Vos's ability. Dr. J. G. Machen, in his own right a superior scholar, is reputed to have said, "If I knew half as much as Dr. Vos, I would be writing all the time."

THE PRINTED EVIDENCE Dr. Vos left behind of his scholarly activity, if not voluminous, is respectable and important. A good deal of what came from his pen is to be found in various Biblical encyclopedias and in the now defunct *Princeton Theological Review*. But when we think of Dr. Vos as an author, we think primarily of his books, all of them closely reasoned and compactly written. The passing of the years has not outmoded them. His *Biblical Theology* is so highly thought of that it is used in several seminaries today. A new edition of *The Self-Disclosure of Jesus*, revised by his son, the Reverend Johannes G. Vos, has just come off the press. Only a few years ago there was enough demand for his *Pauline Eschatology* to warrant a reprint, and the last edition of *The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Kingdom of God and the Church* came off the press three years ago. His notes on *The Teaching of Hebrews*, being edited by his son, is to appear in book form in 1955. That his lectures on dogmatics prepared for his students in Grand Rapids, three volumes of them, were never published

s a matter of regret by all who have used them because of their clear and rich statement of the tenets of Reformed theology. In not one of his published works was Dr. Vos popular. Rather, he was the theologian's theologian.

One cannot but picture Dr. Vos as he scholarly theologian sitting in his ibrary, surrounded with books and immersed in his studies. But there were also moments when he gave his mind respite by turning to poetry. He was fond of quoting from his well stored mind passages of poetry preferably taken from classical authors, passages noted for their beauty. He was a poet himself, and it was no inferior muse that visited him. Poems issued from his inspired mind almost till his dying day. More than one hundred fifty were published in six little volumes over a spread of years. Most of these are of a religious nature and are permeated with a refreshing Christian mysticism giving expression to facets of Christian truth that elude the power of the ablest theologian to put in words. When, for example, as poet he makes Christ the object of his contemplation, he sings of the innermost and tenderest experiences of his soul as he seeks and finds his Saviour and celebrates the sweetness of an intimate communion with his Lord. This same spiritual note, so profound and touching, one finds also in *Grace and Glory*, a volume containing six solid sermons preached in the chapel of Princeton Theological Seminary.

Not all his poems are of a religious nature. In some he gives utterance to the emotions stirred up in him in the presence of sublime objects of nature, such as a mountain, an ocean, a desert, a sand storm, or an earthquake; in others he pictures the glories of more commonplace objects as these affected him. Like a good Calvinist he did not try to make every poem religious by dragging in some remark about the majesty of God. Sometimes he is satisfied with merely describing the thought or emotion and letting it stand in its own right as a legitimate human experience. Though he did nearly all his lecturing and writing in the English language, he wrote most of his poems in the Holland language, a fact showing either that when the muse stirred him, he could best express himself in the language of youth and parental home, or that he deliberately exercised himself in the use of his native speech from sheer love of it. The poems, too, reveal an able linguist, one being even in Latin and one in German. Not only poetry, but also painting was an art in which he displayed a keen interest.

FROM observing his manifold interests we pass on to noting the complexity of Dr. Vos's personality. No biographer is likely to do complete justice to the man. Every account of him is sure to omit some less outstanding trait or to stress it out of its correct proportions. But some traits were obvious enough. Though he was an erudite man and a thinker and honored as such, he was an extremely modest man who never in any way sought public applause and its heady effects. This modesty, though a natural trait, was reinforced by his being temperamentally a scholar who loved the quiet haunts of his study more than active participation in life or public acclaim. At times he styled himself a mystic, and his aversion to publicity must perhaps in part be ascribed to the mystic strain in him. Perhaps he nursed this trait to the point of weakness; at least, there were not a few who thought so. If there was one trait closely related to his diffidence, it was his reticence, by which a part of his inner life was kept a closed domain and curiosity mongers were repelled. In warding off their probing he was happily aided by his unfailing courtesy and by a sense of quiet humor. Yes, unfailingly courteous he was, and that without respect of persons. One can readily understand why he was not a militant figure as some of his colleagues at Princeton were.

In spite of his departure for Princeton Dr. Vos continued to be an influence in the Christian Reformed denomination. Curatorium had designated Rev. J. H. Vos, his father, to teach dogmatics in his stead for a year, and, to make the assignment easier for his father, the son prior to his leaving spent the summer in writing a compendium of his lectures on dogmatics, a work so well done that it was used as a textbook in our seminary for several years. The lectures themselves were made available in typewritten form to all who wished to possess them, and there were many such. His *Biblical Theology* is still used as a text in our Seminary, and his other published works have a place on the library shelves of many a clergyman. Not a few of the graduates of our seminary that felt the need of advanced study attended Princeton for a year or two, lured no doubt by the good name and fame of their Alma Mater's former professor, and were sure to select some of the courses he offered. In these ways Dr. Vos still spoke among us, and perhaps still speaks. The extent of this influence, though it cannot be measured, must be considerable.

The influence of Dr. Vos lingered in a more subtle way. When he joined our faculty, he was a young man fresh from the university. He cherished high ideals of scholarship, and, being a good teacher, he naturally kindled in the soul of his students something of the ardor of his own lofty idealism. He inspired his students so that they caught something of the nature of his type of scholarship and kept it alive in church and school. Having sat at his feet, they saw the vision and became followers of the gleam. Only in this way can we explain the insistence on high scholastic requirements whenever Synod appointed a professor in the Seminary. If at all possible the lofty standards that once had prevailed must be maintained. The maintenance of such standards, it was clearly understood, called for the expansion of our educational facilities. It is a striking fact that the synod of 1894, the first to convene after the departure of Dr. Vos, took a notable step forward in realizing this ideal. Who will deny that the agitation culminating in the Calvin College and Seminary of today owed at least something to the influence of this young professor who toiled among us only five short years?

Having taught forty-four years, five at Grand Rapids and thirty-nine at Princeton, Dr. Vos retired and chose to spend the days of his retirement at Santa Ana, California. Here death removed from his side his wife, the former Catherine Smith, well known as the author of a most excellent version of Bible stories for children. The last ten years of his life he made his home with his daughter Marianne, wife of Dr. W. T. Radius, professor of classical languages at Calvin College. His oldest son, Johannes, once a missionary to Manchuria, is now a professor at Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, teaching Bible. The other two sons reside at Harrisburg. Mrs. M. Van Vessem and another sister, Gertrude, live in Grand Rapids. August 13, 1949, God called His servant home at the high old age of eighty-seven years and five months. His remains were interred by the side of those of his wife at Roar-

Geerhardus Vos — Continued

ing Branch, Pennsylvania, where the family had a summer home. Thus he who never had been a stormy petrel on life's sea, but loved the peace and quiet of a student's haunt was delivered out of a world of confusion, turmoil, and war, and was given a place among the immortals in the realm of everlasting peace. Viewed against the background of the church and school that he served for five years, he was great; but seen against the larger background of his own age, an age which through unbelief culminated in rankest pessimism and slaughter, he looms greater still, immensely greater. In a world in which theological scholarship was increasingly dominated by the forces of unbelief and of liberalism Dr. Vos was in his gentle way a hero of faith.

The Sudan United Mission

by LILLIAN V. GRISSEN*

A TRAVELER concentrated his attention on a simple but noble statue situated in the heart of Khartoum, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. It is a statue of General Gordon, hero of the Sudan at the turn of the century. He is seated on a dromedary's back, looking intently across the vast dark realms of inner Africa.

"Ought not that figure to have faced the city?" he asked his guide.

"No, sir," replied the native, "they set him looking, not toward the palace where he lived, nor towards the Nile by which he might have escaped, but towards the Sudan for which he died. He is waiting, sir, for morning to dawn across the Sudan."

Today, the streaks of dawn have emerged in "Bilad-es-Sudan," or, "The Land of the Blacks." Not only are the people black, but there is the hopeless black of fetish cruelty, the despondent black of sin and Satan, the depressive black of ignorance and illiteracy, and the dolorific black of sickness, ill health and poverty. Today, some three hundred missionaries, seventy-two main stations, and almost seven hundred outstations of the SUM are among the lights of the morning in this black land.

While reminiscing over the fifty years that have elapsed since the organization of the Sudan United Mission, the Mission also looks ahead. The morning has dawned, true . . . but one does not know how far the day has been spent. The SUM sees accomplishment and is encouraged as it looks back at its humble beginning; a burning passion in the heart of a young missionary.

* * *

A WRINKLE of discouragement creased this young man's brow, as he gazed unseeingly out of his window, clutching another letter of decline in his hand. He had been receiving so many of late, this young man, this Dr. H. Karl W. Kumm, the founder of the Sudan United Mission.

Karl, born in 1874, serious and thoughtful by nature, witnessed the period during which Africa was being subdued by both Great Britain and France. He did not see the wealth and prestige which the acquisition of this great land added to the British and French empires. He saw only a huge, yawning black cavity, a satanic sanctuary, where millions of black people, created in the same Image in which he himself had been created, were sinking deeper into the abyss of eternal death. And he, and his fellow Christians, were doing nothing about it! Too, Satan was enjoying the notorious assistance of the followers of the false prophet, Mohammed.

The Sudan, that part of Africa lying immediately south of the Sahara desert and Egypt, stretching from Gambia and Senegal in the West, to Ethiopia on the East, and having for its southern boundaries Liberia, Ivory Coast, Gold Coast, Dehomey, Southern Nigeria, Southern Cameroons, Belgian Congo and Uganda, had been unpleasantly aware of the existence of white men for nearly two centuries. The name "white man" was almost synonymous with slavery, raids, exploitation, cruelty and death.

As a young man Dr. Kumm joined a German mission seeking entrance into the Sudan via upper Egypt. His fervor and zeal could not down, and he spoke of the passion of his heart whether opportunity did or did not present itself. While in Egypt he married Lucy Guinness, who shared his ideals and aims. Lucy was the daughter of Dr. Grattan Guinness, also an ardent and active enthusiast for the propagation of the Gospel in the Sudan. Their married life was brief, but bubbling over with tireless activity in the dissemination of information and enthusiasm for their cause.

Together they returned to England and together they attempted intensively and extensively throughout Great Britain and Ireland to persuade the larger denominational missionary societies to enter the field in order to stem the wild-fire advance of Islam.

They met with repeated, crushing disapointment as society after society expressed its agreement with the need together with its inability to assist because of existing commitments in other fields. Undaunted, and with an abundant faith, Dr. Kumm, encouraged by the Church of England, urged all the free churches to join in an effort to evangelize the Sudan. The Sudan was then known as "the last great unevangelized mission field in the world," but also as the "white man's grave."

A large group met in Sheffield, England, in 1902, at which time the "Sudan Pioneer Mission" was organized, and their official magazine, 'The Lightbearer'" was instituted. For two years this group worked tirelessly propagating their cause through the printed page and "lantern lectures."

Interest intensified and the enthusiastic supporters saw that concrete results were appearing. Dr. Kumm's joy knew no bounds when on June 15, 1904, the group reorganized under the name, Sudan United Mission. A Board of Directors was chosen, and an Executive Committee for action appointed.

With Dr. Kumm on the Executive Committee the 'action' was not long in coming. Just two weeks after the

* Mrs. Grissen, now residing in Grand Rapids, has served as missionary in Nigeria. The present article is one of three that will appear in the *Journal*.

SUM organized, it was decided to send an expedition of investigation to the Upper Benue river and to the Bauci Hill country in Nigeria. Not a month elapsed before Dr. Kumm, Rev. J. L. Maxwell, and J. G. Burt left the shores of England. On September 17, 1904, the trio reached the walled town of Wase, some 650 miles inland from the mouth of the Niger. Near here the first SUM mission station was built.

* * *

"THE WHOLE SUDAN FOR CHRIST" — not a small objective, this . . . nor one easily accomplished. The SUM recognized from its very beginning that theirs was a battle not only against paganism, but also against Mohammedanism. There was only one way of staying this advance, and that was by evangelizing the pagan tribes before Islam gained its treacherous and powerful hold. This they aimed to do by establishing a chain of stations across the vast Sudan.

Through its indefatigable leader, Dr. Kumm, and his colleagues, the aims and purposes of the SUM were heard around the world. Societies, churches, denominations and individuals prayed, gave and supported. The young tree grew, and where originally the founders were the complete tree, it soon became but a part of the tree, as other branches sprang forth. Today, in addition to the British Branch there are the United States Branch (of which the C. R. C. Sudan mission is an autonomous section) (1906), South African Branch (1907), Australian and New Zealand Branch (1911), Danish Branch (1912), Norwegian Branch (1922), Canadian Branch (1924) and the Swiss Branch (1952). These branches operate today throughout parts of Nigeria, French Equatorial Africa, French Cameroons, and Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.

The pioneers established the first station at Wase, coping with the problems of blackwater fever, malaria, sleeping sickness and strength-sapping heat. Language was no little barrier, but the greatest adverse circumstances which confronted them were the open hostility of the natives, and the almost impregnable curtain created by Islam.

* * *

SINCE the sixteenth century the peoples of the Sudan had lived in stark fear of the white man, the slave raider. The appearance of a white man brought to their terror-stricken minds visions of coming raids. The raids were not necessarily made by the white man, but the people knew that often the purpose of the raid was to secure slaves for the white man in far away countries.

A raid was terror and horror personnified. Picture a small "bush" town in the heart of Africa, surrounded by a wall of mud. Its people lie sleeping while hostile, barefooted raiders creep stealthily towards the doomed village. A sudden halt, a brief-impatient pause for instruction, and the signal sounds! The air groans with blood-curdling yells as the raiders attack, forcing their way through gates, and scaling the walls. Soon fighting is at a minimum as the women and children cower silently in the huts, looking for an opportunity to escape. With wails and moans the brave break madly away, only to be captured at the guarded gates. In a frenzy they return to see all the thatch roofs in flame!

The hiss and crackle increase, and those who are still bravely resisting are cruelly overpowered. Too much resistance is not tolerated, and often a raider wields his blade swiftly . . . and dries the dripping blade. Old men and women are kicked away or knocked insensible. Younger men and hardy boys are tied together, and girls and young women roped neck to neck, while babies are collected and put into bags. A long cruel trek to the ocean-side, accompanied by death, follows the raid.

This was the memory the pioneers sought to overcome and erase. As the British government substituted administration and government for chaos and lawlessness the raids diminished. Slaves were freed, but were left homeless, poor, and broken in spirit. The government suggested a freed slaves' home, and the SUM grasped the opportunity to win the confidence of the people. The Lucy Memorial Freed Slaves Home (named in loving memory of Lucy G. Kumm who passed away in 1906) existed for sixteen years, and of the two hundred fifty children cared for during this period, some one hundred were baptized. The girls, as well as the boys, were given an education, and God's blessing upon this project was unmistakable during these early years. Many of the girls became wives of evangelists and teachers. The home also brought disappointment to the early missionaries, but the lessons learned still linger. The prime cause of failure in some respects was the result of that which was reckoned to be its greatest advantage. The children had received Christian training without opposition of any kind, and later, on the battlefield of reality, they were unable to withstand persecution.

* * *

THE PROBLEM of the advance of Mohammedanism was not one against which a single stratagem of attack sufficed. The problems of slavery and winning the confidence of the people abated as the years went on, but conversely the battle against Islam increased in intensity. Even today Islam's power has not reached its peak, and its zeal and fanaticism for propagation of its doctrine can only be conquered with a mighty witnessing for Jesus Christ, and a special blessing of the Holy Spirit.

Often the ground seemed barren and unfruitful during those early years of clearing, plowing and planting. But if Dr. Kumm could attend the Jubilee meetings of the SUM in early 1954, his heart, so burdened for the Sudanese, would feel lighter and his head would bow in thanksgiving for the advance of the gospel in the Sudan during the past fifty years.

LETTERS TO THE JOURNAL

DEAR SIRS:

In the *Reformed Journal* of June, 1954, on page 12, Mr. P. Van Dyken says: "And whereas Scripture calls it a marriage, it cannot be a continual living in adultery. The one excludes the other."

This seems to be a new kind of doctrine which hitherto we have always overlooked. In this way we never have understood what Jesus said in Matt. 19:9: "He that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery" (cf. Matt. 5:32). Jesus did not say that they commit adultery until the time when they have a "heartfelt sorrow for and confession of that sin." Did the Lord perhaps overlook that possibility? It seems that the disciples understood the Lord for they say after the state-

ment of Jesus: "It is not expedient to marry." So they understood that the sin of adultery continues and therefore the safest way out would be not to marry. But Mr. Van Dyken comes to help them. He says that taking another man's wife is adultery all right, but that can be forgiven after confession and then there is straight sailing for the parties. Whether this can be done three or four times, Mr. Van Dyken does not say. They who are left behind are not even mentioned. Children may be involved, but all have to keep silent and may not even cry unto God about it, for the one who left them (now please listen) has confessed his sin and now is as clean as if he had never sinned.

In the case of divorce Mr. Van Dyken gives a solution in a difficult matter, namely that when the civil authority grants a divorce such a divorce is legal because (please listen) "this authority is God given." The same authority permits a second and perhaps a third marriage and the two are *legally* united — Hollywood fashion. Of course for church members the matter is not finished yet, for they should do confession before the church.

Here again we have a new doctrine, namely that when the civil authority has granted a divorce, "such is legal." However, God had united the parties, and Jesus said that what God has united no one should separate. No one, whether civil authority or church or one of the parties involved, is allowed to break the marriage. It is a command of God and God has given no exceptions for any one. When the civil authority grants a divorce it sins against the command of God. When the church (of course, after confession) accepts the act of the civil authority, then the church also sins.

Next we read: "Be very affectionate to them, but be sure to have rubber gloves on when you contact them." To state it mildly, this is an unwise, sarcastic way of describing those who want to be obedient to God. They are pictured as *two faced* people, so nice and helpful when meeting the sinners in question, but in their heart they say: "This sinner is far from the kingdom of God." That must be the rubber glove. We may never expect a blessed solution when we put others in such a ridiculous frame; it should be below our standard. For Mr. Van Dyken goes on to say about the rubber gloved people, that their teaching is that the blood of Christ is insufficient to wash away the sin of the adulterers. Happy to say that no one member in our church can be blamed for such an expression and it is very well possible that many of such sinners in question are waiting for us in Zion. When our sins are taken away, it is not a sign that the results of sin also have disappeared; these results will stay with us till the crooked ways are straightened or when we die and being fully sanctified appear before the throne of God. But it is the result of sin and in this case the remaining in sin which the church should never allow.

After many statements which Mr. Van Dyken has made, he comes now with a question and in the way the question is written it is expected to have the answer in it. "Or did He give us in the case of David an example of how they are to be solved?" For David, in the case mentioned, this was his fifth wife and all were alive. So this is not advisable in our time. Besides, David first killed the party which stood in the way. We cannot do this either. Of course, it will be said this is not what is meant, the thought is that David had sinned and after sinning confessed his sin and all was forgiven although the child died. Now is not this exactly what our church is doing today? When the party who was left is not any more and the adulterers do confession and show in their lives an earnest desire to live from now on according to *all* the commandments of God, then the church will forgive in the name of God and acknowledge them to the right of the communion of the saints. So please try to find a better example than that of David.

What is the reason that this divorce matter has been debated for so many years? There is only one answer, namely, that we start from the condition of the sinner: what his happiness may be, and that if we should bring too many obstacles in his way, he may be lost for ever. The right way to come to a solution is only to study what the church is and how she has to deal with the members to keep the church holy. The church is the body of Christ and should shine forth his glory, his holiness. She should be the "pillar and ground of the truth." "To the end that we should be to the praise of his glory." So should the light of the church shine forth in this dark world. The fear for the commandment of the Lord should prevail by all its members and if sinned against it, the church should arise at once and ban such sin from her midst. The members of the church are her servants and we may never turn this around to make the church the servant of the sinners. It should be known to every one committing this sin that he is outside of her inner circle. Then there is no need for rubber gloves, for all will know that this sin is not allowed. We all know that no lodge members are allowed in our church, and many of them may be in heaven. Why not make the same rule for adultery?

If we do not turn against the law and the testimony, we have a right to expect blessings of the Lord, but if we are only concerned about those who sin, their happiness and everlasting life we will see the Lamp taken away, and given them more worthy than we.

J. P. PUNT, Gardena, Calif.

DEAR MR. EDITOR:

Though averse to prolonging this discussion, may I, because of the lateness and incompleteness of Dr. Daane's reply to my former note, ask a bit of space again?

I urge interested readers to re-read my note on page 14 of the May *Journal* comparing closely with our brother's brief answer on page 15 of the September issue.

With appreciation we read this paragraph of his reply: "Let me state plainly that I do believe that a Christian in loving must discriminate between the objects of his love . . . in loving the believer and the unbeliever he must keep eyes open to the differences between the believer and the unbeliever and that for the same reason; to love each in a different *manner*."

Now let us put Gal. 6:10 alongside of that: ". . . let us work that which is good toward all men, and especially toward them that are of the household of the faith."

May I now submit that these together put us well on the road to the answer to Dr. Daane's question (February *Journal*, p. 5, last column): "Does the Bible teach that we must first discriminate between men and then dispense our ethics?"

Whether we call it a different *manner of loving* or a different *kind of love* we are glad to agree that there is a *difference* in the love we bear to God's children.

Sincerely yours,

C. Holtrop, Pantego, N. C., Sept. 3